

THE KUMĀRASAMBHAVACAMPŪ — A STUDY

Campū is a form of literature which has its own attraction in the skilful admixture of prose and poetry that it presents: *gadyapadyamayam kāvyaṃ campūr ity abhidhīyate*. There are some very good specimens of it in Sanskrit literature. Beginning with the *Nalacampū* a whole class of literature in this form has grown up over the centuries. One of the latest instances of this is the *Kumārasambhavacampū*, the adaptation in Campū form of the great poem, the *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa. In the entire modern Sanskrit literature pertaining to Kālidāsa which includes original plays or poems on him or adaptations of his works, there is no other work in this literary form.

Its author is King Sarfoji II, known in Sanskrit literature as Śarabhoji, the Sanskritization on sound analogy, of course, of Sarfoji, who ruled over Tanjore from 1800-32 A.D. A great patron of learning, he made Tanjore, a centre of attraction for all savants in Sanskrit, Tamil and Marathi. Not only that, he was himself a scholar and a writer of note in Sanskrit and Marathi. There are at least four Sanskrit works to his credit: *Smṛtisārasamuccaya*, *Smṛtiśaṅgraha*, *Mudrārākṣasacchayā* and the work under reference, the *Kumārasambhavacampū*, undoubtedly his best work, being a creative composition unlike the first three which are compendia or abridgements of older works. King Sarfoji attracted to his court a number of Pandits whom he patronized by liberal grants of land or rich rewards.

The greatest monument to king Sarfoji's memory is Sarasvathi Mahal Palace Library at Tanjore which is named after him. During his life time the scholar-king had been enriching this collection by not only the copying of the Mss. but also purchasing as many of them as were available for sale during his frequent pilgrimages to Banaras. The result: the Sarasvathi Mahal Library now surely is one of the richest and the costliest libraries of the Oriental manuscripts in India.

In the very beginning of his work the author presents the rationale of his going in for a Campū form for his composition avoiding exclusive verse or exclusive prose. According to him a verse without prose does not really go down the heart. Equally, prose without verse is not relished by it. It is their combination, their admixture, which like the combination of *sudhā* (nectar) and *mādhvika* (spirituous liquor distilled from the *madhūka* flowers) which gives particular satisfaction to connoisseurs:

*padyaṃ hr̥dyam apīha gadyarahitaṃ dhatte na hr̥dy āspadaṃ  
gadyaṃ padyavivarjitaṃ ca bhajate nāsvādyatāṃ mānase /  
sāhityaṃ hi tayor dvayor api sudhāmādhvikayor yo bhavat /  
santoṣaṃ hr̥dayāmbuje vitanute sāhityavidyāvidāṃ //*

The author is conscious of the merits of the *Rāmāyaṇacampū* by Bhoja, a predecessor of his. He, therefore, sets about writing his work, faultless in composition, very much like him adorning it with charming figures of speech in words full of Rasa:

*taṭputraḥ śarabhojivarmaṇṛpatiḥ sāhityasāmr̥jyabhūr  
bhojo rāmakathāsudhāmādhuritaṃ campūprabandhaṃ yathā /  
sālaṅkāracamatkriyārasapadaṃ śuddhaṃ ca sandarbhaṭaḥ  
saṃgrathnāti kumārasambhavamahācampūprabandhottamam //*

Published by Sri Sankaragurukulam, Srirangam, as Volume 5 in its publication series in the year 1940 and edited by Sri T. K. Balasubramanya Aiyar, the Campū is divided into four parts called the Āśvāsa, which have 33, 30, 60, and 79 verses and 4, 4, 7 and 4 prose paragraphs of varying length respectively. The first Āśvāsa begins with an invocation to Lord Śiva. Next is given a brief account of the ancestry of the poet. He is the son of Tulajendra, a descendant of Maloji of the Bhosala family of Tanjore.

After these preliminary remarks the story of the birth of Kumāra is taken up which closely follows the story as given by Kālidāsa in his *Kumārasambhava*.

The account of the birth of Kumāra starts in the work as in the model before its author, the *Kumārasambhava*, with a detailed description of the glory and the grandeur of the mount Himālaya, which is said to have married Menā, the mental progeny of the Manes and begot from her a son Maināka and a daughter, Pārvatī, who is once seen by Nārada and is predicted to become Śiva's wife. As for Śiva, he is practising penance on a Himalayan tableland. Pārvatī at her father's instance serves him. While this goes on gods tormented by the demon Tāraka go to Brahmā for succour who asks them to contrive for Śiva's attraction towards Pārvatī which may result in her marriage with him and the birth of a son who would destroy the demon. Indra thinks of Cupid who appears before him with his companion the spring. He is sent on a mission of softening Śiva for Pārvatī. He, however, does not succeed

in it and is reduced to ashes by the Lord much to the sorrow of Rati, the Cupid's wife. With firm resolve to secure Śiva for her as her husband Pārvatī takes to severe austerities. One day the Lord disguised as a Brahmacārin enters into her Āśrama. He speaks disparagingly of Śiva pointing out many of his angularities and dissuades Pārvatī from pursuing her desire to which she does not agree. Unable to stand Śiva's denunciation she is about to leave the place when he appears before her in his true form. Pārvatī suggests to him to approach her father for her hand which he does by sending Arundhatī and the seven Ṛṣis who settle his marriage three days thence. The marriage solemnized, the couple spend a month in the Himālayan city moving thereafter to mount Sumeru. After they had enjoyed marital bliss for a hundred years, the gods, who had in the meantime got tired of the long wait, appear before them with the earth and pray for a son. The love sports having been interrupted, the Lord asks the earth to carry his seed which she deposits in the Gaṅgā and from which is born a strange child with six mouths and twelve arms who out of pity is fed by the six mothers, the Kṛttikās, on their milk, acquiring the name Śaṇmātura thereby. Śaṇmātura or Senāpati is put at the head of their army by the gods in the battle between them and the demons and leads them to victory, thus bringing long-awaited relief to the three worlds that had been groaning under the oppressions of Tāraka.

After narrating this story, the author pays obeissance to the goddess of speech and asks for her forgiveness for any deficiencies, errors or omissions on his part due to hurry. And with this the fourth Āśvāsa and along with it the whole work comes to an end.

#### *Critical appreciation*

The Campū starts on a note of full confidence on the part of its author in his capacity in the successful execution of his work. The very second verse of it written in the form of the imaginary dialogue between him and the goddess of learning exudes it:

*mātar vāgdevi, kiṃ te sarabhanarapate vatsa! kāryaṃ mamāste,  
saubrahmaṇyodbhavārthe ruciramṛdupade campukāvye 'bhilāṣaḥ /  
vijñātaṃ, haimaśailasphaṭikamaṇiśīlāsaṅghasaṃpātajāta-  
sphītātōpābhṛgaṅgāpravahanaśaḍrśaḥ santu te vāgvilāsaḥ //*<sup>1</sup>.

«O mother Sarasvatī, (Sarasvatī) — yes my child, king Śarabha, what do you expect of me? I want to compose a Campū with soft and pleasant words, dealing with the birth of Subrahmaṇya. (Saravsatī) — I know. May the play of your words be like the flow of the celestial Ganges gaining in intensity born of its fall on the crystal rocks of the mount Meru ».

This confidence seems to have worn off as the author had arrived at the end of his work. In the last verse of his Campū, again addressed to Sarasvatī, he appears to be rather conscious of his shortcomings and inadequacies:

*mātar vāni! namaskaromi caraṇadvandvāmbujaṃ tāvakaṃ  
kṣantavyā kila bālakena racitā mātṛā 'gasāṃ santatiḥ /  
yaṃ me 'tra skhālitam, mayā yad api votsṛṣṭam tvarāgauravāt  
tat sarvaṃ mama sāhasaṃ bhagavati! kṣāntvā prasannā bhava //<sup>2</sup>.*

« Mother Sarasvatī, I bow to your lotus-like feet. You, the mother, should forgive the chain of offences committed by me. Whatever error I have committed in it (the Campū) or whatever omission I have made in a hurry, O goddess, that is a rash act on my part. You would forgive it and be pleased ».

The contrast between the tone and tenor in the two verses, both of them addressed to Sarasvatī, one in the beginning and the other at the end of the work cannot be lost on any careful observer. These two verses between them sum up the author's own assessment of his work. And, everything said and done, no assessment could be more objective than that of the author himself. Looked at from this point of view, it appears that both the statements of the author are on the whole correct. The work is characterized by an excessive flow of words which have a kind of rhythm of their own. The work has a number of descriptions, the descriptions of the Himālaya, of Śiva practising penance, of Tāraka oppressing the worlds, of the forest under the spell of Cupid and spring, of the penance of Pārvatī, of the rites and festivities relating to the Śiva-Pārvatī wedding, of the love-sports of Śiva and Pārvatī and finally, the battle between the gods and the demons. Each one of these has given an opportunity to our author to show his *vāgvilāsa* which, as explained by him through an apt simile, simply enthralls the reader. But while there is *vāgvilāsa* in abundance, the work does suffer from some jerks here and there, it does give some idea of having been hastily done up, something having been left out in a hurry: *yad api votsṛṣṭam tvarāgauravāt*. What the author, therefore, says, in the last verse is not out of modesty only, it may have, as it does have, a grain of truth in it.

We find that upto the second Āśvāsa the story moves rather leisurely. Upto that, the work deals only with the birth of Pārvatī, Śiva's penance, Pārvatī's service to him, Cupid's burning by him and Rati's lamentations. The author lends considerable space to the description of the Himālaya, Śiva in penance, the condition of the forest under the influence of Cupid and spring and so on. From the third Āśvāsa onwards the story picks up momentum and the events follow each other in quick succession. The descriptions also become shorter, lesser space being devoted to them,

thereby giving rise to the feeling that the author was hastening to bring his work to completion; he was therefore omitting some of the details found in the parent poem: *yad api votsṛṣṭam tvarāgauravāt*. He dismisses the post-marriage love-sports of Śiva and Pārvatī in just 9 verses while Kālidāsa devotes as many as 44 verses to them. Similarly the description of the Pārvatī's make-up in the work also lacks the elaborate details found in the *Kumārasambhava*. There might have been some compelling reason for the author to hurry through, especially, towards the end. Again, he has throughout his work very closely followed the story of the parent poem, the *Kumārasambhava* except towards its end where he has made a significant departure. The departure relates to the description of the birth of Senāpati. In the *Kumārasambhava* it is said that the gods having got tired of the long wait for the birth of Senāpati sent Agni to look for Śiva. Agni assumed the form of a pigeon and entered into the apartment where Śiva and Pārvatī were engaged in lovesports. Śiva discovered the pigeon to be Agni in disguise. He felt offended but was appeased by Agni who told him that he had been sent by the gods who had been waiting to see him for hundred years to plead with him for begetting a son who would kill their oppressor Tāraka. The love-sports having been interrupted Śiva's seed was picked up by Agni who lost his natural lustre thereby and got disfigured. For making an unwarranted intrusion into the chamber and causing obstruction to love-sports he incurred the wrath of Pārvatī who cursed him to be leperous, all-consuming and atrocious in deeds with smoke inside. In the *Campū* under notice the entire incident has been reshaped. According to it after the gods had waited for long, they appeared before Śiva and requested him to beget a son who would kill Tāraka and offer them relief from the torture that they had been suffering from for a fairly long time:

*sarve lekḥāḥ sapadi girijāsaṅkarau dīrghakālaṃ  
tāv anyonyaṃ prakāṣitasukḥau saṃgatau nityatṛptaṃ /  
dhyātvā senāpatijanikṛte tuṣṭuvur vedavāgbhir  
devo 'py enāṃs tripuradamaṇaḥ procivān vācam etām //*<sup>3</sup>.

Śiva agrees to fulfil their desire:

*he devāḥ kāṅkṣitaṃ vaḥ suciram idam ataḥ saṃprasannaḥ kariṣye //*<sup>4</sup>.

He asks the earth to carry his seed: *madvīryaṃ bhūtadhātṛi vahatu*. Pārvatī at this curses the gods not to be able to beget children on their wives and the earth to be polyandrous:

*tato 'mbikā 'tikupitā śaśāpa sukhaviḥnataḥ /  
svastṛiṣv aprajaso devān bhuvam cānekabharṭṛkām //*<sup>5</sup>.

3. IV.64.

4. IV.65.

5. IV.66.

When we compare the incident as described in the *Kumārasambhava* with the one in the *Kumārasambhavadampū* we find that the latter omits the Agni episode altogether, it straightaway presents the gods, including the goddess earth, before the primeval couple, Śiva and Pārvatī while they are engaged in love-sports and it is the earth which at Śiva's instance carries his seed. This appears to be rather naive lacking the finesse of the master writer with which he had approached it. To admit a host of gods and a goddess in the strict privacy of Śiva and Pārvatī would simply be revolting to more developed taste. It also would look incredible as to how they could land themselves there. There is no mention in the work anywhere that they had been permitted entry. To descend on the couple, whatever the urgency prompting it, while it is engaged in love-sports betrayed a height of impropriety. It looks strange as to how our author could not see through it. It is precisely to guard against it that the genius of Kālidāsa had invented the episode of Agni, and the guise for it of a pigeon. A bird could enter the privacy of the apartment, and not a god or a human being. It is a different matter if it is found out later and its true form discovered. Kālidāsa adopts a clever device here for conveying the message of the gods to the Lord. All this means that even if somebody had to approach the Lord he had to do it discreetly. And this has precisely been done in the *Kumārasambhava*. Again to ask the earth to carry the seed in the very presence of Pārvatī looks rather indecorous. Everything said and done one cannot help feeling here that the naturalness characterizing the description of the incident in the parent poem is missing in its adaptation. A departure from the primary narrative would be welcome only if it leads to some improvement in it. As it is, no improvement is visible in it, hence no need for the departure from the old narrative.

Now a word about the language of the poem. It is generally of a very high order. It is characterized on the whole by the qualities of perspicuity, sweetness and grammatical accuracy. Furthermore, it has the classical ring about it. While going through it one feels as though one is going through the work of an older period. At places the author's style reminds us of that of Bāṇa and Subandhu especially where he indulges in paranomasia, e.g.,

- (1) *yatra ca, mahādeva iva himakhaṇḍapāṇḍare, puruṣottama ivotphullasarasāīruhalocane, kamalāsana ivopagatahaṁsamāṇḍale, suraloka iva suparvavaṁśādhiṣṭhāne,... vaikuṇṭha iva hari-nādhīṣṭhite, satya aloka iva sahiranyagarbhe, puṇḍarīkākāṣavak-ṣastaṭa iva vanamālālāṅkṛte, kāvyaprabandha iva nānāvārṇa-dhātuvicitre,... paraśurāma ivādharitarājamaṇḍale, mahākāsāra iva sarvatomukhavalatpuṇḍarīke, himotpattibhūmāv apy ahi-mahite, dhṛtakṣame 'pi durāsade, gaṅgāprabhave 'py abhiṣme... (himālaye) /<sup>6</sup>.*

- (2) *atha sa manmathaḥ haimavatyām adhityakāyāṃ vaiyāghracar-  
māstarāṇaṃ devadārutaravedikāmadhyam adhyāsīnaṃ samā-  
dhiyogasamucitāvasthānasundaratarākṛtiṃ bhujaṅgamonnad-  
dhajaṭākālāpabhāsuram karnāvasaktadviguṇākṣasūtravalayaṃ  
kañṭhaprabhāsaṃsargādhikanīlāṃ rauraviṃ tvacaṃ dadhānaṃ  
nāsāśikharavinyasteṣatstimitāgratārāvispanditapakṣmamālā kṣi-  
tritayam ambuvāham ivāvṛṣṭisaṃrambham apām ādhāram ivā-  
nuttaraṅgam antararuddhaprānānilatayā pradīpam iva nivāta-  
niṣkampam ūrddhvodbhāsinībhir lalāṭanetrājvālāmālābhir gla-  
payantam iva mṛṇālasūtrasukumārān bālendumayūkhān, niṣīd-  
dhākṣhilakaraṇapracāram, ātmany evātmīnam avalokayantaṃ  
bhagavantam antakāntakam adrākṣit /<sup>7</sup>.*

Sometimes the author presents in beautiful prose a paraphrase of what the older poet has said in verse. The paragraph reproduced below as a specimen:

*santataniṣyandamānatuhināsāradhautaraktaṃ padam apaśyatām api  
kirātānāṃ nakharāyudhanakharandhramuktamuktāphalāny eva vi-  
bhinnavanakumbhikesaripadavīparijñānahetavaḥ, sātapaśrṅgāśraya-  
ṇam evādhāṣṇanugatasiddhānāṃ vṛṣṭibādhānivāraṇam, dhāturasanya-  
stākṣarā bhūrjatvaca eva surasundarīnām anaṅgalekhāḥ, kīcakaran-  
dhreṣu darīmukhodgatasamīrapūraṇam eva kinnaragaṇopagāṇam,  
kaṇḍūlavaitaṇḍakaṣaṇodbhūtasaralagandha eva sāṇsurabhīkaraṇa-  
paṭuḥ, vanitāsakhavanecarāṇāṃ jyotirlatā eva suratapradīpāḥ, atigha-  
najaghanapayodharāṇām aśvamukhīnāṃ tuhinadurgame 'pi mārge  
mandam eva gamanam...<sup>8</sup>.*

is nothing but the following half a dozen verses of Kālidāsa put in prose form with some abbreviation and a change of wording here and there:

*padam tuṣārasrutidhautaraktaṃ yasminn adrṣṭvā 'pi hatadvipānām /  
vidanti mārgeṇ nakharandhramuktair muktāphalaiḥ kesarīnāṃ  
kirātāḥ //  
nyastākṣarā dhāturasena yatra bhūrjatvacaḥ kuñjarabinduṣoṇāḥ /  
vrajanti vidyāddharasundarīnām anaṅgalekhakriyayopayogam //  
yaḥ pūrayan kīcakarandhrabhāgān darīmukhotthēna samīraṇena /  
udgāsyatām icchati kinnarāṇāṃ tānapradāyitvam ivopagantum //  
kaṇḍūlavaitaṇḍūḥ karībhir vinetuṃ vighaṭṭitānām saraladrumāṇām /  
yatra snutākṣīratayā prasūtaḥ sānūni gandhaḥ surabhīkaroti //  
vanecarāṇāṃ vanitāsakhāṇāṃ darīgṛhotsaṅganiṣaktabhāsaḥ /  
bravanti yatrauśadhayo rajanyām atailapūrāḥ suratapradīpāḥ //  
udvejaty aṅgulipārṣṇibhāgān mārge śīlībhūtahime 'pi yatra /  
na dūrvahaśroṇipayodharārtā bhindanti mandāṃ  
gatim aśvamukhyāḥ<sup>9</sup> //.*

7. After II.18.

8. After I.8.

9. Kumārasambhava, I.21-3.



Occasionally the *Kumārasambhava* idea contained in two or three verses is put by our author in one single verse:

*dakṣāvajñānamuktasvatanur atha satī pūrvapatnī purārer  
utsāheneha nītāv ajani himavatā śrīr yathā menakāyām /  
āsīd āśāprasādo vavur aparajaso vāyavaḥ śaṅkhaśabdāt  
pāścātyā puṣpavṛṣṭir jananaadinam abhūt prāṇisaukhyāya tasyāḥ //* <sup>10</sup>.

The *Kumārasambhava* verses are:

*athāvamānena pituḥ prayuktā  
dakṣasya kanyā bhavapūrvapatnī  
satī satī yogavisṛṣṭadehā  
tām janmane śailavadhūṃ prapede //  
sā bhūdharāṇām adhipena tasyām  
samādhimatyām udapādi bhavyā /  
samyakprayogād aparikṣatāyām  
nītāv ivotsāhagunena sampat //  
prasannadikpāmsuviviktavātām  
śaṅkhasvanānantarapuṣpavṛṣṭi /  
śarīriṇām sthāvarajaṅgamānām  
sukhāya tajjanmadinam babhūva //* <sup>11</sup>.

In spite of the metre employed by our author being a bigger one, some brevity in condensing the idea of three verses in one is no doubt noticeable here.

By far the most striking instance of how the Campū attempts a paraphrase of the *Kumārasambhava* verses can be had from the following wellknown Kālidāsan verse:

*sthitāḥ kṣaṇam pakṣmasu tāditādharāḥ  
payodharotsedhanipātacūrṇitāḥ /  
valīṣu tasyāḥ skhalitāḥ prapedire  
krameṇa nābhīm prathamodabindavaḥ //* <sup>12</sup>

which is found in the Campū as:

*kṣaṇam sthitvā pakṣmasv atha nipīḍyādharadalam  
tato vakṣojordhvasthalapatanaacūrṇīkṛtibhṛtaḥ /  
skhalitvāsyaḥ ramyākṛtivalīṣu paścāc ca tīrṣu  
prapannās taṃ nābhikuharam atha nūtnāmbupṛṣṭatāḥ //* <sup>13</sup>.

10. I.10.

11. *Kumārasambhava*, I.21-3.

12. *Ibid*, V.24.

13. III.5.



Though the language of the work is on the whole easy and simple, the author does go in for some recondite or obscure expressions here and there. Thus he uses *bhūvalaripu*<sup>14</sup> for king, *vedavṛndaśikhara*<sup>15</sup> for *vedānta*, *sutrāman*<sup>16</sup> for Indra, *vadikriyākarma*<sup>17</sup> for *abhivādana*, *vadi* meaning *abhivādana*, *vadi* = *abhivādane*, *niketabhūmi*<sup>18</sup> for a covered place, *pragunīta*<sup>19</sup> for *āvṛtta*, repeated, *tāra*<sup>20</sup> for *śuddha*, pure, auspicious, *aṣṭāpāda*<sup>21</sup> for gold, *śilādajanus*<sup>22</sup> for Nandī, *lekha*<sup>23</sup> for deity. In line with the above is his use of words which are structurally peculiar for the sense intended of them. They are: *diṣṭabhūmi*<sup>24</sup> meaning one 'to whom a seat is offered', *dattāsaṇaḥ*, *sthānajñatvacapaḥ*<sup>25</sup> one who possesses the expert knowledge of how (an archer) should stand or one who is skilled in the knowledge of marking an aim, *sthāna* = aim, *ahāryasamānadhairyā*<sup>26</sup>, 'one whose even ordinary or normal patience cannot be disturbed', *samāna* = ordinary or normal, *gariyasī* in *viśiṛṇaparṇavṛttitā tapaḥsthiter gariyasī*<sup>27</sup> meaning hindrance, obstruction, *pitṛmatāt*<sup>28</sup> with the permission of the father, *mata* standing for *anumata* or *anumati*. At a couple of places in the work one comes across elliptical construction too, e.g., *kalpa* for *kalpavṛkṣa* in *kalpaprasavamṛdulam*<sup>29</sup>, *śāmbhavaḥ* for *śāmbhavaḥ karaḥ* in *nījanābhideśanihataś tu śāmbhavo dharaṇīdharendrasutayā sakampayā ruru-dhe*<sup>30</sup>. Occasionally a word in the work is altered due in all probability to metrical exigencies. A rather interesting instance of this is found in the line:

*patyau vāllabhyam asyā himagiriduhitur menakāyāḥ svamātuḥ* /<sup>31</sup>

where the name *menā* is altered to *menakā* though the latter is the name of a particular nymph. The editing of the work also leaves something to be desired. A few readings in it are definitely corrupt and need improvement, e.g., *drṣṭyā* in *drṣṭyā nūtanayeva śuṣkasarasīmatsyāṅganā*

- 
14. I.4.
  15. I.17.
  16. II.1.
  17. III.56.
  18. III.6.
  19. III.60.
  20. IV.3.
  21. IV.4.
  22. IV.15.
  23. IV.64.
  24. II.1.
  25. II.20.
  26. After III.2.
  27. III.7.
  28. III.18.
  29. IV.9.
  30. IV.44.
  31. IV.47.

*tarpitā*<sup>32</sup>, *nāga* in *saivaṃ maṅgalatūryanāgaruciraṃ snātā*<sup>33</sup>, *niḥata* in *nījanābhideśanihataś tu śāmbhavaḥ*<sup>34</sup>, *kṛīḍaty ekāṃ* in *kṛīḍaty ekāṃ triyāmām iva divasagaṇāny anaiṣīt sukhātmā*<sup>35</sup>, where obviously *vṛṣṭyā*, *nāda*, *niḥita* and *kṛīḍann ekāṃ* respectively, would be the correct readings. In an isolated instance *jātaṃ kalpaprasavamṛdulaṃ śekharaṃ sarvaṃ eva*<sup>36</sup>, *śekhara*, the masculine, is found used in the neuter. In an equally isolated instance the two words, though in construction, are used far apart from each other:

*yathāpradeśasaṃgatā bhujaṃgamā vibhūṣaṇī -*  
*babhūvur eṣa nūtnatā śarīramātragocarā /*  
*phaṇāmaṇiprabhā tu yā purā babhūva saiva sā*  
*śiraḥsthitō vidhuḥ paraṃ kuto 'bhavan na nūtanah //*<sup>37</sup>.

*eṣa* in the second line is in construction with *vidhuḥ* in the fourth, both being intercepted by a number of words. In the verse immediately following the above there seems to be the defect *adhikapadatva*, excess of words. The verse in question reads:

*sādhārane sati maheśasamāśraye 'pi*  
*bhasmenducarmabhujageṣu vidhuḥ viḥāya /*  
*bhasmājīnādī pararūpamavāpa nendur*  
*rantaḥ sthitā malinatā kimu tatra hetuḥ //*<sup>38</sup>.

« While the ashes, the moon, the skin and the serpents all in common attach themselves to Śiva, it is the ashes, the skin, etc., with the exception of the moon, that assume a different form and not the moon. Is it due to the impurity settled within? ».

Now here *vidhuḥ viḥāya* and *nenduḥ* convey one and the same idea. One of these could easily have been dispensed with.

The work is marked by a couple of typical Taddhita formations which cannot be considered to be unusual in the composition of a South Indian whose love for them has found an echo in as early a work as the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali which says: *priyataddhitā dāksi-ṇātyāḥ*. As specimens we may mention *dhaurandharī*<sup>39</sup>, *pāramparī*<sup>40</sup>,

32. II.29.

33. IV.5.

34. IV.44.

35. IV.63.

36. IV.9.

37. IV.10.

38. IV.11.

39. I.4.

40. I.15.

*svācchandya*<sup>41</sup>, *sauvarga*<sup>42</sup>, *sāvitra*<sup>43</sup>, *sautrāmaṇa*<sup>44</sup>, *sāhasra*<sup>45</sup>, *aunnatya*<sup>46</sup>, *vaiyāghra*<sup>47</sup>, *aibha*<sup>48</sup>, *kṣauma*<sup>49</sup>, *tārtīyika*<sup>50</sup>, *sauvarṇa*<sup>51</sup>, *vāllabhya*<sup>52</sup>, *śārvara*<sup>53</sup>. Of these, the use of the feminine suffix *ñiṣ* after the *Taddhita* formations, *dhaurandharya* and *pāramparya* is uncommon.

One of the special features of the work is the occurrence in it of some of the lines which can easily pass off as good sayings. A few of the typical ones of these are reproduced below by way of illustration:

- (1) *mānaiṣiṇo hy unnatāḥ* /<sup>54</sup>
- (2) *prabhūnām prāyena svāśriteṣu svaphalaparatayā gauravaṃ cañcalaṃ syāt* /<sup>55</sup>
- (3) *asatkathā śrutā hi pāpakāriṇī* /<sup>56</sup>
- (4) *śuddhyartham yad adhiṣṭhitam sukṛtibhis tat tīrtham ācakṣate* /<sup>57</sup>
- (5) *kuṭumbinām prakṛtayaḥ kalatrāśrayāḥ* /<sup>58</sup>
- (6) *duṣpradharsyaḥ khalūgrāḥ* /<sup>59</sup>

The work has as many as 11 metres. The author seems to have a special fascination for the *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*. He composes in this metre the bulk of his work, 123 verses out of a total of 202 verses. Of the remaining 10 metres he uses *Mālinī* in 19, *Anuṣṭubh* in 15, *Prthvī* in 13, *Pañcacāmara* in 12, *Upajāti* in 8, *Śikharinī* in 5, *Bhujāṅgaprayāta* in 2 verses, while *Āryā*, *Svāgatā*, *Mandākrāntā*, *Mañjubhāṣinī* and *Vasanta-tilakā* each, he uses only once. Except the *yatibhaṅga* in the following few verses there is no violation of the metres:

- (1) *brahmādyālayapūritotsavasamājollāsitā śobhate* /<sup>60</sup>
- (2) *āpādaṃ sphuraduttarottarasamastāṅgābhīrūpyaṃ vapuḥ* /<sup>61</sup>

- 
41. I.7.
  42. I.12.
  43. I.20.
  44. III.41.
  45. III.51.
  46. III.51.
  47. IV.9.
  48. Ibid.
  49. IV.5.9.
  50. IV.9.
  51. IV.2.38.
  52. IV.47.
  53. IV.59.
  54. I.13.
  55. II.1.
  56. III.29.
  57. III.45.
  58. III.57.
  59. II.24.
  60. I.3.
  61. I.12.



dry pond refreshed by a fresh shower, and the digit of the moon waiting for the night-fall, respectively, Pārvatī evaporating heat from her figure scorched by the blaze of the sun and the fire as the earth emitting vapours on account of fresh showers at the end of the summer, the seeing by the Himālaya of the Saptarṣis as a shower without a cloud or a fruit without a flower, Pārvatī with her face scented by the smoke of the lājas (fried rice) as the lotus-stalk with an autumnal lotus made fragrant with the sweet smell of *lodhra* brought by bees, the stars as the drops from the moon, Arundhatī as the success incarnate of penance, present a few of the good illustrations of Utprekṣā in the work.

Sometimes a chain of a figure of speech is employed to emphasize a point. Thus the great joy experienced by the Himālaya on the unexpected advent of the Saptarṣis is expressed by means of three Utprekṣās. The Himālaya feels as transformed as a fool turned wise, as a thing made of iron turned into that of gold, as some one from the earth uplifted to heaven.

The author also occasionally draws word-pictures with the help of his imagination.

While describing the make-up of Lord Śiva at the time of his marriage he imagines the things normally associated with him to be the constituents of his make-up: his ashes are the cosmetics, *aṅgarāga*, his chain of skulls, the wreath of flowers for the head, his tiger and elephant skins, the pair of clothes, the third eye, the forehead-mark, *tilaka*, and the serpents, the ornaments.

Among the many descriptions found in the work it is in the description of the battle between the gods and the demons that we find far greater originality on the part of the author. How life-like is the fling of the demons at the gods can be seen from the following verse:

*nedaṃ nandanakānaṃ viśasanaṃ naitāḥ suparvāṅganās  
tīkṣṇāḥ śastraparamparāḥ samuditāḥ pratyarthimarmacchidaḥ /  
naitat satraṃ asṛgvasāntranikarakrūraṃ mahāyodhanaṃ  
nāyaṃ gautamadārājāracarito netā 'suras tārakaḥ /<sup>74</sup>*

« This is not a Nandana park, it is a killing house, these are not the celestial damsels but accumulated piles of sharp-edged weapons which pierce the vitals of the enemies. This is not a sacrificial session but a great battle dreadful on account of mass of blood, marrow and arteries. This is not Indra, the paramour of the wife of Gautama, but the leader, the demon Tāraka ».

The demons also indulge in the cat-calls at the gods which look so real and life-like by the quick flow of the words:

*agne 'nnaṃ vaha, vāhi vāta vipine, parjanya garjāmbare,  
mṛtyo martyajaneṣu gaccha, dhanada tvam kośagehe vasa /*

*vasvādityagaṇā bhavanti bhavatāṃ śrāddhakriyāsu kramā  
no yuddheṣv iti sainikā ditibhuvāṃ devān avāmaṃsata // 75.*

Agni, carry food, Vāta, blow in the forest, Parjanya, thunder in the sky, Mr̥tyu, go to the mortals, Kubera, confine yourself to the treasury, Vasus and Ādityas, go to attend the śrāddha ceremonies, and not to the battle-field. Thus the soldiers of the demons slighted the gods.

The Campū has quite a few of the Rasas: Sānta in the description of Śiva and Pārvatī practising penance, Karuṇa in Rati's lamentations at the loss of her husband, Śṛṅgāra in its variety of Vipralambha at the discomfiture of Pārvatī at the burning of Cupid and of the variety of Sambhoga in the description of love-sports after Śiva-Pārvatī wedding, Hāsya (very briefly) in love-dalliances of the divine couple and Vīra in the battle between the gods and the demons.

Though the story in the work in the main is the same as that of the *Kumārasambhava* and though much of the verse or the prose portion in it is a paraphrase of the verses of Kālidāsa, it is not devoid of an individuality of its own. It attempts at retelling the *Kumārasambhava* in its own words. It is an attempt, where the setting is that of the reteller while the backdrop to it is that of the older work. The result: The words and expressions from Kālidāsa's poem peep out into this work even in the new frame. A reader who has studied the *Kumārasambhava* has it in his unconscious mind. While going through the Campū, he is comparing it all the time and much to his interest and curiosity finding it well-rendered. The fly over from verse to prose and vice versa, the characteristic-in-chief of a Campū, acts as a relief to him.

As a first attempt at retelling the *Kumārasambhava* in a different literary form by a scion of the princely family of South India with a good sprinkling of his own exquisite composition, the Campū provides real pleasure to connoisseurs.